

SECRET

AIR

BMA-29660

Chief of Station, Germany

31 October 1957

Chief of Base, Munich

INFO: SR
EE

Operational/REWOOD/LOIMPROVE/ARBATH

AEGAPKIM-1/Technical Interrogation

Forwarded herewith is the report of Subject's technical interrogation, conducted in Munich on 25 October 1957, in accordance with the request of Chief, GART, MDE, and case officer, [] []

Approved: [] []

Attachment:
as stated h/w

Distribution:
3 - GOS/O w/att
✓ 2 - SR w/att
2 - EE w/att

MRE:php

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2006

COPY ROUTING	
1	3 w/att
2	63
3	
4	
5	

OCT 31 1957	
RECEIVED	FILE

SECRET

SECRET

Attachment to BMA-29660

TECHNICAL INTERROGATION REPORT

Operational/REDWOOD/ICIMPROVE/ANKRATH

Subject: ABCAPELIN-1

1. Subject was afforded technical interrogation on 25 October 1967 in Munich at the request of Chief, CART, MOB, and case officer, [] Subject was previously tested on 6 March 1956 and 6 June 1952 at MOB. The test was conducted in the German language in which Subject is fluent.
2. The present interview of Subject was designed to assist in a general security check of Subject's contacts and connections. Subject has been serving as a principal informant on Ukrainian emigre groups for KUBARK for a number of years. Questions were posed to ascertain the true nature of Subject's connections with AIS and UPSWING and to check on the possibility of hostile intelligence control of Subject.
3. Below are listed the relevant questions posed during testing. Norm and control-type questions are generally omitted since their function is primarily to assist the examiner in the technical analysis.

Phase I:

4. Do you now have any assignments for the UPSWING organization that you have not told us about?

Answer: No.

Subject responded to the above question during testing. It appears that he may be withholding information in this area. Subject was challenged on his reaction but he insisted that there was something else on his mind whenever the question was posed. Subject indicated that he had once mislaid reports that he had written for UPSWING under a pile of papers on his desk and had consequently failed to show these reports to [] According to Subject he has no reason to conceal his reports for UPSWING and has received no missions that we do not already know about. Since the response is significant and consistent in comparison to other responses on the test, it appears that Subject may be practicing deception.

SECRET

9. Do you now have a secret connection, unbeknownst to us, with any Western intelligence organization?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

11. Do you now write reports for any intelligence organization that you have not told us about?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

Phase II:

15. Did you ever in your life serve as a Saksot or agent for the Soviets?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

18. Do you now have a secret connection with a Soviet intelligence service?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

22. Since you have worked with us, have you been directly approached by Soviet Intelligence?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

Subject responded to this question on one occasion out of three during testing. The response is more in the nature of anticipation to the question rather than a direct response indicative of deception practices.

Phase III:

27. Are you deliberately falsifying your reports to us?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

29. Are you now being blackmailed by anyone?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

32. Have you ever received a pseudonym from the Soviets?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

33. Do you now have a secret means of communication with Soviet Intelligence?

Answer: No. No deception indicated.

~~SECRET~~

Attachment to EOWA-29660
Page 3

34. Have you ever signed any secret agreements for the Soviets?

Answer: No.

No deception indicated.

Phase IV:

35. Have you withheld from us anything important concerning Colonel SCHMALSCHLAGER?

Answer: No.

No deception indicated.

36. Have you withheld from us anything important concerning Otto KREUZER?

Answer: No.

No deception indicated.

37. Have you withheld from us anything important concerning Marianna Elisabeth MOSKVA?

Answer: No.

No deception indicated.

4. Conclusions:

- a. Subject's responses to the questions outlined in Paragraph 3 above, with the possible exception of Question 4, do not appear to indicate any attempts at deception. Although Subject was a weak reactor, control-type responses were obtained which lend the test substantial reliability.
- b. Subject consented to the present interview with a degree of enthusiasm and cheerfulness that appeared to contrast remarkably with Subject's critical remarks concerning testing subsequent to his last interview. Subject stated that he felt absolutely sure of himself on the present test since his mind was clear and he was certain that he could answer any question presented to him with a truthful answer. This completely cooperative attitude, at times somewhat overplayed by Subject, managed to last to the end of the interview. Subject seemed to have a ready and in most cases a plausible explanation for any response that was pointed out by the undersigned during testing and follow-up interrogation. Subject indicated at the close of the interview that he was sure that he had passed the test and the undersigned would find that to be correct.

[]
~~SECRET~~